

REMARKS

I. Status of Application

Claims 1-40 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-40 have been rejected.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,754,248 to Faroudja. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

The Examiner was not persuaded by arguments that Faroudja merely discloses the conversion and decoding of the video signal to produce video frames and that no portion of Faroudja discloses or even contemplates acquiring a scanning line number from a range of scanning line number being scanned on a display, or even further, adjusting a timing for a display changeover specification based on the scanning line number. In response to such arguments, the Examiner alleges that column 11, line 52 – column 13, line 14 of Faroudja discloses acquiring a scanning line number from a range of 525 or 625 scanning lines being scanned on a display of an HDTV. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the grounds of rejection have still failed to establish that Faroudja discloses or suggests all the features of claim 1, as required to maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claim 1 recites (among other things):

...means for acquiring a scanning line number
from a range of scanning lines being scanned on a
display...

Faroudja nowhere discloses or suggests a means for acquiring a scanning line number from a range of scanning lines being scanned on a display, as claimed. The portions of Faroudja relied upon by the grounds of rejection (i.e., column 11, line 52 – column 13, line 14) disclose nothing more than the decoding of a video source to produce video frames that may (or may not) be scanned on a display at some time in the future.

For example, Faroudja discloses that “FIG. 13 shows the decoding of a 50 Hz video source for PAL output...”, “FIG. 14 shows a modified decoder 26’ for the decoding of a 24 fps film source recorded (or transmitted) at 24 Hz for PAL output...” and “FIG. 15 shows the decoding of an HDTV Hz video source” (column 11, lines 54-55; column 12, lines 9-11; column 12, lines 33-34, emphasis added). That is, all of the portions of Faroudja cited by the Examiner disclose decoding a video source to thereafter provide an output that may (or may not) be scanned on a display at some time in the future. In fact, the portion of Faroudja cited by the Examiner explicitly states that “[t]he 525- or 625-line 25 Hz progressively-scanned video data may be provided [i.e., in the future] for an advanced display output” (column 11, lines 63-64).

However, in stark contrast to Faroudja, claim 1 plainly requires the features of a means for acquiring a scanning line number from a range of scanning lines being scanned on a display. Faroudja’s disclosure that 525- or 625-line 25 Hz progressively-scanned video data may be provided for an advanced display output, which may (or may not) be scanned on the advanced display at some time in the future, does not disclose, and cannot possibly suggest, the novel features of acquiring a scanning line number from a range of scanning lines being scanned on a display, as recited in claim 1.

Indeed, a skilled artisan would recognize that Faroudja's disclosure is completely different from the claimed invention. Faroudja describes a signal processing apparatus and method for recording and transmitting motion picture film sources and non-film interlaced or progressively scanned video sources employing any one of several international television standards. (Column 1, lines 3-15). That is, Faroudja's apparatus and method for decoding a video signal and producing an output are independent of any device which may ultimately display the decoded output in the future.

On the other hand, the claimed scanning line number from a range of scanning lines being scanned on a display is completely different from the lines of resolution of the video data provided in a frame (e.g., Faroudja's 525- or 625-line data) that may (or may not) be scanned on a display in the future. Faroudja nowhere discloses, or even remotely suggests, acquiring a scanning line number from a range of scanning lines being scanned on a display, much less the features of adjusting a timing for a display changeover specification based on the scanning line number, as claimed.

In addition, the MPEP requires that the Examiner must give the claims of the present application their broadest reasonable interpretation (MPEP §2111.01). One of ordinary skill in the art would not reasonably interpret the recitation "means for acquiring a scanning line number from a range of scanning lines being scanned on a display" to include Faroudja's disclosure that 525- or 625-line 25 Hz progressively-scanned video data may be provided for an advanced display output which may (or may not) be scanned on a display at some time in the future. Indeed, for *at least* the reasons discussed above, such an interpretation would require that one of ordinary skill ignore the express teachings of Faroudja that the 525- or 625-line 25 Hz video data

is decoded and then provided as an output to a display for display at some time in the future. Therefore, Applicant submits that the Examiner's proposed interpretation of claim 1 is not reasonable as required by MPEP §2111.01.

Thus, Applicant submits claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Faroudja for *at least* these reasons. Additionally, because claims 11, 21 and 31 recite features similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1, Applicant submits these claims are allowable for least reasons similar to those set forth above.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Faroudja in view of Kato

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-5, 9-10, 12-15, 19-20, 22-25 and 32-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Faroudja in view of Kato (US 6,396,874). Applicant traverses these rejections for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

Because Kato, either taken alone or in combination with Faroudja, fails to compensate for the above noted deficiencies of Faroudja as applied to claims 1, 11, 21 and 31, Applicant submits that claims 2-3, 12-13, 22-25 and 32-35 are allowable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Additionally, because independent claims 4, 9, 14 and 19 recite features similar to those discussed with regard to claim 1 above, Applicant submits these claims are allowable for reasons similar to those set forth above. Further, Applicant submits claims 5, 10, 15 and 20 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Yokogawa in view of Faroudja

The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 16, 26 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yokogawa (US 6,463,210) in view of Faroudja. Applicant traverses these rejections for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

In the rejection, the Examiner contends that Yokogawa discloses most of the features recited in claims 6, but concedes that Yokogawa fails to disclose a scanning lines number from a range of scanning lines being scanned on a display. In an attempt to compensate for this deficiency, the Examiner applies Faroudja, alleging it discloses a scanning lines number from a range of scanning lines being scanned on a display.

However, Applicant submits that as set forth above, because Faroudja fails to disclose this feature, even if Yokogawa and Faroudja are combined as suggested, the applied combination fails to disclose, at least, means for acquiring, when one frame is divided into two fields for displaying, a display scanning line number from a range of scanning lines being scanned on a display.

Thus, Applicant submits that claim 6 is allowable for *at least* these reasons. Additionally, because claims 16, 26 and 36 recite features similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 6, Applicant submits these claims are allowable for *at least* reasons similar to those set forth above.

V. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Yokogawa in view of Faroudja and further in view of Kato

The Examiner rejected claims 7-8, 17-18, 27-30 and 37-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yokogawa and Faroudja in view of Kato. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

Applicant respectfully submits that because Kato, either taken alone or in combination with Yokogawa and Faroudja, fails to compensate for the above noted deficiencies of the

Yokogawa/Faroudja combination as applied to claims 6, 16, 26 and 36, claims 7-8, 17-18, 27-30 and 37-40 are allowable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Andrew J. Taska /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666

Date: September 25, 2008